

**BUILDING RESILIENT COMMUNITIES, WETLAND ECOSYSTEMS AND ASSOCIATED CATCHMENTS IN UGANDA**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

**For the procurement of International Consultant to conduct Midterm Evaluation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | **BUILDING RESILIENT COMMUNITIES, WETLAND ECOSYSTEMS AND ASSOCIATED CATCHMENTS IN UGANDA PROJECT** |
| **Scope of Advertisement:** | International |
| **Type of Contract:** | Individual Consultant |
| **Post Type:** | International Consultant |
| **Duty Station:** | Home-based (with mission travel if possible) |
| **Expected Areas of Travel:** | A representative sample of the 24 project districts in Eastern and South Western Uganda. |
| **Languages:** | English |
| **Duration of Contract:** | 25 working days spread over a period of two calendar months |
| **Start Date** | Immediately after concluding Contract Agreement |

1. **INTRODUCTION**

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) -supported Green Climate Fund (GCF) financed project titled *Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems And Associated Catchments In Uganda Project* (PIMS 5711) implemented through the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) and Uganda National Meteorological Authority (UNMA) which is to be undertaken in 2021. The project is implemented in 24 districts including Kabale, Kisoro, Kanungu, Ntungamo, Bushenyi, Buhweju, Mitooma, Rubirizi, Sheema, Rukungiri, Rubanda, Rukiga, Budaka, Pallisa, Ngora, Bukedea, Mbale, Kaliro, Namutumba, Kibuku, Butebo, Tororo, Butaleja and Kumi;. The project is supported by GCF, UNDP and Government of Uganda (GoU). The project was started on 8th June 2017, though full implementation commenced in November 2017 and is currently in its fourth year of implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this Mid-Term Evaluation.

1. **PROJECT BACKGROUND AND INFORMATION**

The impact of climate change, coupled with other human and environmental stressors, is increasing degradation of wetlands and their associated ecosystem services in Uganda. This is negatively affecting the livelihoods of approximately 4 million people living in and around wetland areas. In fact, over 80% of the people living adjacent to wetland areas in Uganda directly use wetland resources for their household food security needs. Given that wetlands are highly vulnerable to changes in the quantity and quality of their water supply, climate change will most likely substantially alter ecologically important attributes of wetlands and will exacerbate the impacts from human activity. The loss of wetlands could exacerbate the impact of climate change as they provide fundamental services that contribute to mitigation of such impacts. This project seeks to support the Government of Uganda to take climate change issues into account when managing critical wetland areas. Project activities were developed to specifically respond to and take into account specific climate-related impacts and vulnerabilities of wetland ecosystems.

This project is restoring wetlands and their eco-system services, based on wise-use principles and guidelines as outlined by the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, with sustainable land management practices and reforestation, is supporting resilient agricultural practices and alternative livelihoods for communities living in these areas to reduce the pressures on the wetlands, and finally is strengthening the climate information and early warning systems to support these communities to make climate-resilient decisions. The project targets two regions – 12 districts in South Western Uganda including; Kabale, Kisoro, Kanungu, Ntungamo, Bushenyi, Buhweju, Mitooma, Rubirizi, Sheema, Rukungiri, Rubanda and Rukiga and 12 districts in Eastern Uganda including; Budaka, Pallisa, Ngora, Bukedea, Mbale, Kaliro, Namutumba, Kibuku, Butebo, Tororo, Butaleja and Kumi;. With a total population of 3,946,366 people and land areas of 13,000Km2

At least 800,000 people in and around the wetlands will directly benefit from this investment. This initiative will improve the lives of some of the most vulnerable people in Uganda, dependent on subsistence agriculture and wetlands for their livelihoods. The project set out to achieve its intended Outcome of ‘*Restore and sustainably mange wetlands and support target communities in wetland areas of Uganda to reduce the risks of climate change posed to agricultural based livelihoods’* through three outputs . Output 1 focuses on restoration and management of wetland hydrology and associated forests. Output 2 focuses on Improved agricultural practices and alternative livelihood options in the wetland catchment. Finally Output 3 focuses on strengthening access to climate and early warning information to farmers and other targets communities to support wetland management.

Since November 2017, the Government of Uganda through MWE in close collaboration with Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) and Uganda National Meteorological Authority (UNMA) with support from UNDP/GCF has implemented the project demonstrating the direct link between the benefits of wetland conservation and people’s livelihood with a specific focus on climate change risks and adaptation opportunities of these restored wetlands. The project is to be implemented in a period of 8 years (2017-2025) with a total project cost of USD 44,262,160 including ((grant) of USD 24,140,160, UNDP co-financing of USD 2,000,000) and Government co-financing of USD 18,122,000)

Being half –way the project life, this MTR will help to document the progress made so far, recommend strategies that will enhance delivery of intended project results commensurate with the investments made. According to the GCF guidance notes, MTEs are a monitoring tool to assess project status and challenges, identify corrective actions to ensure that projects are on track to achieve planned outcomes. As such, MTEs are required for full-sized UNDP supported projects with GCF financing such as this one.

**3.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW**

The MTR will assess implementation of the project progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the UNDP Project Document and GCF Funded Activity Agreement (FAA), and assess early signs of project success, or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made inborder to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results The MTR will also review the project’s strategy and its risks to sustainability.

The MTR will take into consideration assessment of the project in line with the following evaluation criteria from the [GCF IEU TOR](https://ieu.greenclimate.fund/documents/977793/985626/B.06_06_-_Independent_Integrity_Unit_and_the_Independent_Redress_Mechanism.pdf/74fdcf3c-ffc5-42cf-affb-4305347a74a0) (GCF/B.06/06) and [draft GCF Evaluation Policy](https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b28-05), along with [guidance](https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm) provided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC). Additional evaluation criteria can be assessed, as applicable. The IE must assess the following

* **Implementation and adaptive management** – seeks to identify challenges and propose additional measures to support more efficient and effective implementation. The following aspects of project implementation and adaptive management will be assessed: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications.
* **Risks to sustainability** – seeks to assess the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. The assessment of sustainability at the MTR stage considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The MTR should validate the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Reports, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date.
* **Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency** - seeks to assess the appropriateness in terms of selection, implementation and achievement of FAA and project document results framework activities and expected results (outputs, outcomes and impacts).
* **Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities** - looks at how GCF financing is additional and able to amplify other investments or de-risk and crowd-in further climate investment.
* **Gender equity** - ensures integration of understanding on how the impacts of climate change are differentiated by gender, the ways that behavioural changes and gender can play in delivering paradigm shift, and the role that women play in responding to climate change challenges both as agents but also for accountability and decision-making.
* **Country ownership of projects and programmes** - examines the extent of the emphasis on sustainability post project through country ownership; on ensuring the responsiveness of the GCF investment to country needs and priorities including through the roles that countries play in projects and programmes.
* **Innovativeness in results areas** - focuses on identification of innovations (proof of concept, multiplication effects, new models of finance, technologies, etc.) and the extent to which the project interventions may lead to a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways..
* **Replication and scalability** – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporate d in independent evaluations).
* **Unexpected results, both positive and negative** - identifies the challenges and the learning, both positive and negative, that can be used by all parties (governments, stakeholders, civil society, AE, GCF, and others) to inform further implementation and future investment decision-making.

**4.0 MTR APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

The MTR team must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful.

The International Consultant will work with a counterpart National Consultant; the latter to provide the local content while the former will be the Lead Consultant to ensure the deliverables are realized. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. baseline funding proposal submitted to GCF, FAA, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Performance Reports, Quarterly Progress Reports, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, project budget revisions, records of surveys conducted, national strategic and legal documents, stakeholder maps , and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The MTR is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[1]](#footnote-1) ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, Implementing Partner, NDA focal point, government counterparts, the UNDP Country Office, Regional Technical Advisers, and other principal stakeholders and beneficiaries

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR . Stakeholder involvement should include (where possible) surveys/questionnaires, focus groups, interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to executing agencies, senior officials and task team/component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, local government, CSOs, project beneficiaries, etc.,. If possible (given the COVID restrictions) the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to selected 24 districts ( Pallisa, Kibuku, Bukedea, Namutumba, Butaleja, Budaka, Tororo, Kaliro, Ngora, Butebo, Kumi and Mbale in Eastern Uganda  and Kabale Kisoro, Rukungiri, Kanungu, Bushenyi, Buhweju, Mitooma, Sheema, Rubirizi, Rubanda, Rukiga and Ntungamo in South Western Uganda*)* where the MTR team should be able to meet the project responsible parties and conduct site verification, to be decided in consultation with the project team. Data collection (government data/records, field observation visits, CDM verifications, public expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) will be used to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to: assessment of Theory of Change, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred).

The specific design and methodology for the MTR should emerge from consultations between the MTR team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the MTR purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The MTR team must, however, use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women’s empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the IE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the MTR must be clearly outlined in the Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the MTR team.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. The final report must also describe any limitations encountered by the MTR team during the evaluation process, including limitations of the methodology, data collection methods, and any potential influence of limitation on how findings may be interpreted, and conclusions drawn. Limitations include, among others: language barriers, inaccessible project sites, issues with access to data or verification of data sources, issues with availability of interviewees, methodological limitations to collecting more extensive or more representative qualitative or quantitative evaluation data, deviations from planned data collection and analysis set out in the ToR and Inception Report, etc. Efforts made to mitigate the limitations should also be included in the MTR report.

**5.0 DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR**

The MTR team will assess the following categories of project progress. The following questions are intended to guide the MTR team to deliver credible and trusted evaluations that provide assessment of progress and results achieved in relationship to the GCF investment, can identify learning and areas where restructuring or changes through adaptive management in project implementation are needed, and can make evidence-based clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing project implementation to deliver expected results and to what extent these can be verified and attributed to GCF investment.

**5.1 Project Strategy**

5.1.1 Project design:

1. Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
2. Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
3. Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
4. Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
5. Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
6. If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

5.1.2 Results Framework/Log frame:

1. Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s log frame indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
2. Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
3. Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance, etc.) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
4. Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.
5. Ensure that the indicators (gender-disaggregated) are SMART, aligned with GCF/Results Management Framework (RMF)/Performance Measurement Frameworks (PMFs) and the guidance in the [GCF programming manual.](https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/programming-manual)
   1. **Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency**
6. Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analysed and reviewed during project initiation?
7. Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
8. How is the project Theory of Change (ToC) used in helping the project achieve results/ How is the ToC applied through the project??
9. Verify the mitigation impact that the project has achieved. Has an appropriate MRV system for GHG emission been established and implemented? Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
10. Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
11. Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
12. What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
13. To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
14. How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
15. How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
16. To what extent did the project’s M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
17. Are the project’s governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
18. To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
19. Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project apply adaptive management?
20. What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

**5.3 Progress Towards Results**

5.3.1 Progress Towards Outcomes and Outputs Analysis:

1. By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
2. Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each indicator; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Baseline Level[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Level in 1st APR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Achievement Rating[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Analysis: status of indicator; justification for rating (triangulated with evidence and data); how realistic it is for target to be achieved** |
| **Fund Level Impact 1 :** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Fund Level Impact 2 :** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

**5.3.2 Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective**

1. Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.

**5.4 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

5.4.1Management Arrangements:

1. Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the FAA/Funding proposal. Have changes been made and have these been approved by GCF? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
2. Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
3. Review the quality of support provided by UNDP and recommend areas for improvement.

5.4.2 Work Planning:

1. Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
2. Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
3. Examine the use of the project’s results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

5.4.3 Financing

1. Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
2. Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
3. Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
4. Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Comment on the use of different financial streams (parallel, leveraged, mobilized finance), as applicable in the context of the project – see GCF policy on co-finance[[7]](#footnote-7). Discuss whether co-finance related conditions and covenants, as listed in the FAA, have been fulfilled, as applicable.
5. If co-finance is not materialising as planned, discuss the impact of that on the project and results on the ground.
6. Assess factors that contributed to low/high expenditure rate

**5.4.4 Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities**

1. Who are the partners of the project and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
2. Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
3. To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
4. How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

5.4.5 Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

1. Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
2. Is project reporting and information generated by the project linked to national SDGs, NDC and other national reporting systems?
3. Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

5.4.6 Stakeholder Engagement:

1. Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
2. Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
3. Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?
4. Is a grievance mechanism in place? If so, assess its effectiveness

5.4.7 Reporting:

1. Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
2. Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GCF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated APRs, if applicable?)
3. Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

5.4.8 Communications:

1. Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
2. Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
3. For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

**5.5 Sustainability**

Validate whether the risks identified in the FAA and Funding proposal, APRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why. In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability

5.5.1 Financial risks to sustainability:

What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GCF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

5.5.2 Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

5.5.3 Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

* + 1. Environmental risks to sustainability:

Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

**5.6 Country Ownership**

1. To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
2. How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
3. To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
4. Is the project, as implemented, responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, AE indicators, or other goals?
5. Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?

**5.7 Gender equity**

1. Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
2. Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
3. Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
4. Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
5. How do the results for women compare to those for men?
6. Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
7. To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
8. Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?
9. How does the project incorporate gender in its governance or staffing?

**5.8 Innovativeness in results areas**

What are the lessons learned to enrich learning and knowledge generation in terms of how the project played in the provision of "thought leadership,” “innovation,” or “unlocked additional climate finance” for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

**5.9 Unexpected results, both positive and negative**

1. What has been the project’s ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the AE/EE and external.
2. Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
3. What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
4. Do any of the unintended results constitute a major change?[[8]](#footnote-8)

**5.10 Replication and Scalability**

1. What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
2. Assess the effectiveness of exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints? Is there a need for recalibration?
3. What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
4. Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
5. What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

**5.11 Conclusions & Recommendations**

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Explain whether the project will be able to achieve planned development objective and outcomes by the end of implementation.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report’s executive summary.

The MTR team should make no more than 10 recommendations total.

**5.12 Ratings**

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in an *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

Table. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for *Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments Project*.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **MTR Rating[[9]](#footnote-9)** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | N/A |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Output 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| Etc. |  |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |  |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |  |

1. **TIMEFRAME (DURATION OF WORK)**

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 25 working daysover a period of 6 weeks. A National Consultant will complement the Lead/International Consultant for a period of 20 working days over the 6 weeks period. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **NUMBER OF WORKING DAYS** | **COMPLETION DATE** |
| Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report (MTR Inception Report due no later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission) | # days (recommended: 2-4 days) | By 28 August 2021 |
| MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits | # days (recommended: 7 – 15 days) | By 18th September 2021 |
| Presentation of initial findings- last day of the MTR mission | *1 day* | 22nd September 2021 |
| Preparing draft report (due within 3 weeks of the MTR mission) | # days (recommended 5 – 10 days) | 30th September ,2021. |
| Finalization of MTR report/ Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report (due within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft) | # days (recommended 3 – 4 days) | this date shall be 2-3 weeks after the draft report is presented.  By 16th October 2021 |

1. **MTR DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| 1 | **MTR Inception Report** | Proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the MTR report, and options for site visits | No later than 2 weeks before the MTR | MTR team submits to UNDP CO and project management |
| 2 | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of MTR mission | MTR Team presents to Project Management and the UNDP CO |
| 3 | **Draft MTR Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission | Sent to the Commissioning Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, NDA focal point |
| 4 | **Final MTR Report\*** | Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to the Commissioning Unit |
| **5** | **Concluding Stakeholder Workshop** (optional) | Meeting to present and discuss key findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and key actions in response to the report. | Within 1-2 weeks of completion of final MTR report | Led by MTR team or Project Team and Commissioning Unit |

\*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

**8.0 MTR ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project’s MTR is UNDP Country Office. During this assignment, the MTR team will report to the Team Leader Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction (CCDRR) Unit in the UNDP CO who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of deliverables.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultants and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

* 1. Institutional arrangement/reporting relationship

The consultant will work under the daily supervision of the National Project Coordinator and the overall guidance of the Team Leader CCDRR at UNDP Country Office. Overall, the Consultant will report to the UNDP Resident Representative, with regular working relationship with the National Project Coordinator at MWE. The Consultant will report to MWE on technical obligations and to UNDP on all contractual obligations.

8.2 Logistics and administration support

* + 1. The UNDP Uganda and MWE through the Project Management Unit will make available all the transport and ensure that the consultant has access to resources, key partners and sites as planned. The Project Management Unit will facilitate the MTR team to meet with interact with the stakeholders at the national level and in the Districts/communities.
    2. UNDP will support the Consultant in the following areas:
* Access to required information (copy of project document, Annual Work plans, Progress reports and other project related reports).
* Access to UNDP Office and its infrastructure (e.g. conference room and internet while at UNDP).
* Support and assistance to gain access to relevant stakeholders for consultations;
  + 1. UNDP Kampala and the Project Office will coordinate the study and keep abreast of the Mission’s activities during the Consultant’s stay.

1. **TEAM COMPOSITION**

A team of two independent consultants will conduct the MTR - one Team Leader (International with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally) and one National team expert, usually from the country of the project. The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas: The weight to all preferred qualifications apart from the minimum academic qualifications and experience are shown in the Technical Evaluation Criteria below.

**10.0 EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The evaluation team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct (see ToR Annex D) upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866). The evaluation team must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluation team must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

**11.0 PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

| **Instalment of Payment/ Period** | **Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered** | **Approval should be obtained** | **Percentage of Payment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1st Instalment | upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report | UNDP and MWE | 20% |
| 2nd Instalment | upon satisfactory delivery of the draft MTR report | UNDP and MWE | 50% |
| 3rd Instalment | upon satisfactory delivery and approval of the Final MTR report by the RTA | UNDP and MWE | 30% |

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 30%[[10]](#footnote-10):

1. The final MTR report includes all requirements outlined in the MTR TOR and is in accordance with the MTR guidance.
2. The final MTR report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other MTR reports).
3. The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.
4. RTA approvals are via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form)

12.0 APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by **31st March 2021**. Individual consultants are invited to submit technical and financial proposals as applications together with their CV for these positions. UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

12.1 Documents to be included when submitting the Proposals.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications **in one single PDF document:**

1. Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx)[[11]](#footnote-11) provided by UNDP
2. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** ([P11 form](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc)[[12]](#footnote-12)); indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
3. **Technical proposal:**
   1. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
   2. A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
4. **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=29916). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (UNDP Uganda, Plot No. 11, Yusuf Lule Road, P.O. Box 7184 Kampala ) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for “ Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments in Ugnada Project, Midterm Review” or by email at the following address ONLY:  [moses.lutwama@undp.org and copy](mailto:%20moses.lutwama@undp.org%20and%20copy%20)  janet.anyango@undp.org This email address is being protected from spam bots, you need Javascript enabled to view it by 31st March 2021, 5.00pm***.*** Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

**13.0 CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL:**

Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

13.1 Selection Criteria

Qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Individual Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

1. Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
2. Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
   * Technical Criteria weight is 70%
   * Financial Criteria weight is 30%

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | | **Weight** | **Max. Point** |
| **Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required)** | | **70%** | 100 |
| Understanding the Scope of Work; comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal | |  | 30 |
| Minimum educational back ground | |  | 15 |
| Minimum years of experience | |  | 30 |
| Additional competences (agriculture and Environment /M&E) | |  | 25 |
| **Financial (Lower Offer/Offer X100)** | | **30%** | 30 |
| **Total Score** | **Technical Score \* 70% + Financial Score \*30%** | | |

*\* It is a mandatory criteria and shall have a minimum of 50%*

13.2 Recommended presentation of technical and financial proposals

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, you are hereby given a template of the Table of Content. Accordingly, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the IC Standard Bid Document (SBD). The financial proposals should be ALL inclusive.

**14.0 QUALIFICATIONS**

14.1 Academic Qualifications:

Advanced University Degree (Masters or equivalent) in natural sciences; with a specialization in environment, biodiversity, climate change or any other closely related field

14.2 Experience:

1. Minimum 7 years of relevant professional experience in relevant technical areas.
2. Minimum of 4 years proven track record of application of results-based approaches to evaluation of projects focusing on Conservation Science, Natural Resource Management and Climate Change.
3. Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes.
4. Familiarity with Uganda’s development, environment, climate change and other relevant policy frameworks.
5. Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset;

14.3 Competencies:

1. Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies: (10%)
2. Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; (10%)
3. Competence in adaptive management, as applied to GCF Climate Change focal areas, (10%)
4. Experience working with GCF-GEF evaluations; (10%).
5. Experience working in East Africa; (5%)
6. Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Climate change, environment conservation, biodiversity, Livelihood, ecosystem management or food security experience in gender sensitive evaluation and analysis. (5%)
7. Excellent communication skills; (5%)
8. Demonstrable analytical skills; (5%)

14.4 Language and other skills:

Proficiency in both spoken and written English

14.5 Compliance of the UN Core Values:

1. Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN’s values and ethical standards,
2. Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
3. Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability,
4. Treats all people fairly without favouritism,
5. Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

**15.0 CONFIDENTIALITY**

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

**ANNEX A. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED**

1. Funding Proposal
2. Funded Activity Agreement (FAA)
3. UNDP Project Document
4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
5. Project Inception Report
6. All Annual Performance Reports (APRs)
7. Progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
8. Audit reports
9. Mission reports
10. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
11. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team

The following documents will also be available:

1. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
2. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
3. Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
4. Project site location maps

**ANNEX B: Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report**[[13]](#footnote-13)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Basic Report Information *(for opening page or title page)*   * Title of UNDP-supported GCF-financed project * UNDP PIMS# and GCF project ID# * MTR time frame and date of report * Region and countries included in the project * Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners * MTR team members   Acknowledgements | | |
| Table of Contents | | |
| Acronyms and Abbreviations  Project Information Table | | |
| Executive Summary *(2-3 pages)*   * Project Description (brief) * Project Progress Summary * MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table * Concise summary of conclusions * Recommendations Summary Table | | |
| Introduction *(2-3 pages)*   * Purpose of the MTR and objectives * Scope & Methodology: principles of design and execution of the MTR , MTR approach and data collection methods, limitations * Structure of the MTR report | | |
| Project Description and Background Context *(3-5 pages)*   * Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope * Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted * Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites (if any) * Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc. * Project timing and milestones * Main stakeholders: summary list | | |
| Findings *(12-14 pages)* | | |
| **4.1** | Project Strategy   * Project Design * Results Framework/Logframe | |
| **4.2** | Relevance | |
| **4.3** | Effectiveness and Efficiency | |
| **4.4** | Progress Towards Results   * Progress towards outcomes analysis * Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective | |
| **4.5** | Project Implementation and Adaptive Management   * Management Arrangements * Work planning * Financing * Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities * Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems * Stakeholder engagement * Reporting * Communications | |
| **4.6** | Sustainability   * Financial risks to sustainability * Socio-economic to sustainability * Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability * Environmental risks to sustainability | |
| **4.7** | Country Ownership | |
| **4.8** | Innovativeness in results areas | |
| **4.9** | Unexpected results, both positive and negative | |
| **4.10** | Replication and Scalability | |
| **4.11** | Gender Equity | |
| Conclusions and Recommendations *(4-6 pages)* | | |
| **5.1** | Conclusions   * Comprehensive and balanced statements (that are evidence-based and connected to the MTR’s findings) which highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project | |
| **5.2** | Recommendations   * Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project * Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project * Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives | |
| Annexes   * MTR ToR (excluding ToR annexes) * MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology) * Questionnaire or Interview Guide used for data collection * Mission itinerary * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Co-financing table (if not previously included in the body of the report) * Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form * Signed MTR final report clearance form * *Annexed in a separate file:* Audit trail from received comments on draft MTR report | | |

**ANNEX C: MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX (EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA, AND METHODOLOGY)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluative Questions** | | **Indicators** | | | | | | **Sources** | | **Methodology** | |
| Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Do the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level?  To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies? | | Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives.    Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities    Addressing gaps in capacity framework. | | | | | | National policies,  Project Document | | Document analysis | |
| How relevant the project’s intended outcomes?  How relevant is the involvement of different partners in the Project implementation given the institutional and policy framework for environment and food security sectors in Uganda? | | Degree to which the project supports national environmental and development objectives | | | | | | Project documents and evaluations | | Document analysis | |
| Were the project’s objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context? | | Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies | | | | | | Government of Uganda, UNDP, Project  Management | | Interviews | |
| A r e counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?  Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust?  And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Uganda?  To what extent is the project in line with GCF operational programs | | Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities  Coherence UNDP and GCF operational programming | | | | | | Project partners and relevant stakeholders  UNDAF, UNDP/GCF  Programming statements | | Interviews  Document analysis | |
| Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| What expected outputs have been achieved thus far? | | Degree of achievement vis a vis expected outcome indicators | | | | | | PIR 2017 Interviews | | Document analysis  Site Visits  Interviews | |
| To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?  What have the products, such as studies, policy recommendations, dissemination campaigns, etc., affected [keeping in mind that this is a midterm review and several if not many products are still in the implementation or  planning process] |  | | | | | |  | | |  | |
| Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future developments in the field of livelihoods, Climate Change and sustainable environment management in the project districts?  How is the Project addressing fragmentation of environment management policies, and institutional scattering considering this fragmentation?  How is the Project contributing to avoiding fragmentation across policies and cross-cutting mandates?  What other partners can be involved in the Project in a meaningful way to  streamline the issue and by-  pass or address the institutional and policy fragmentation of the environment and climate change in the project districts? |  | |  |  |  |  | Project outcomes    Norms, policies debated, adopted | |  | Document analysis    Stakeholders interviews |  |
| How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to environment and climate change in the project districts?  How has the project incorporated gender issues as the relate to environment and climate change in the project districts? | Involvement of (direct and indirect) beneficiaries in project development and implementation  Incorporation of gender dimension    Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.).    Effect of project aspects implemented at sites | | | | | | Project outputs and outcomes | | | Interviews    Site visits |  |
| What is causing delays in implementation and delivery of outputs of the Project? | Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome by the time of mid-term and actual achievements | | | | | | Findings in project documents, achievement  indicators | | | Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially)  Site visits observation | |
| In what outputs?  Where are the  implementation ‘bottlenecks’?  How can these issues be solved?  What changes need to be implemented? |  | | | | | |  | | | Stakeholder interviews | |
| Partnerships for  implementation | Working relationship between PMU,  UNDP, and other strategic partners as well as donors    Board functions | | | | | | Findings in project documents (PIRs, minutes of meetings)    Indications in interviews | | | Document analysis    Stakeholder interviews | |
| In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen? | Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic | | | | | | Government of Uganda, Project team, UNDP | | | Interviews | |
| Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including  as part of the project | Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach  Role of committees in guidance  Harness effectiveness by analysing how project’s results were met vis-à-vis  intended outcomes or objectives    Draw lessons learned/good practices from the implementation and achievement of results | | | | | | Project partners and relevant stakeholders | | | Document analysis | |
| Efficiency: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and could adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Was the project  implemented efficiently, inline with international and national norms and standards? | Policies adopted / enacted  Policies implemented  Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn | | | | | | Policy documents contain sustainability factors  (policy adopted,  implemented)      Budget arrangements  (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes | | | Documentation analysis    Stakeholder  interviews | |
|  | Was adaptive management used thus far and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation? | | | | | | Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues | | | Project documents | |
|  | How did institutional arrangements influence the project’s achievement of results? | | | | | | Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed | | | Government of  Uganda, Project team,  UNDP | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long term project results? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sustainability possibilities  Does the Project have an exit strategy?  What components should an exit strategy have for this project? | In what way, may the benefits from the project are likely to be maintained or increased in the future? | | | | | | See indicators in project document results  framework and log frame | | | Project documents and reports | |
| Social sustainability factors | Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project’ s longterm objectives? | | | | | | Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained | | | Government of  Uganda, Project team,  UNDP | |
| Political/financial sustainability | Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits? | | | | | | Evidence that particular practices will be  sustained | | | Government of  Uganda, Project team, UNDP; tourism (safari) endeavours | |
| Replicability | Which of the project’s aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives? | | | | | | Evidence that particular practices will be  sustained | | | Government of  Uganda, Project team,  UNDP | |

**ANNEX D: UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM FOR CONSULTANT**

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**MTR Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

**Signed\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ *Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

**ANNEX E MTR RATING SCALE**

**Rating scale for performance**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Explanation** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Satisfactory (S) | Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency |

**Rating Scale for Sustainability**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Explanation** |
| Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained |
| Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| Unlikely (U) | Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |
| Highly Unlikely (HU) | Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure |

**Progress Towards Results Rating Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) | |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

**ANNEX F: MTR Report Clearance Form**

*(to be completed by the Commissioning Unit and UNDP- GCF RTA and included in the final document)*

**Midterm Review Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP-GCF Regional Technical Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ANNEX G: Audit Trail Template**

*Note:* The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report

**To the comments received on (*date*) from the MTR of *The Building Resilient Communities, Wetland Ecosystems and Associated Catchments Project****”***) (UNDP Project ID-*PIMS #)***

*The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution (“Author” column) and not by the person’s name, and track change comment number (“#” column):*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author** | **#** | **Para No./ comment location** | **Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report** | **MTR team**  **response and actions taken** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**ANNEX H: Progress Towards Results Matrix**

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[14]](#footnote-14)** | **Baseline Level[[15]](#footnote-15)** | **Level in 1st PIR (self- reported)** | **Midterm Target[[16]](#footnote-16)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Midterm Level & Assessment[[17]](#footnote-17)** | **Achievement Rating[[18]](#footnote-18)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Objective:** | Indicator (if applicable): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2: |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 4: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etc. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

**ToR ANNEX I: GCF Co-Financing Template (provided as a separate file)**

1. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Populate with data from the Log frame and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Use the 6-point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/policy-cofinancing.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See Section ’9.4 Major Changes and Restructuring’ in the [GCF Programming Manual](https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/programming-manual) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Ratings for Objective/Outcome Achievement and Project Implementation & Adaptive Management: 6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings; 5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings; 4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings; 3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings; 2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings; 1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings, Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment

   Ratings for Sustainability: 4 = Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability; 3 = Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks to sustainability; 2 = Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks to sustainability; 1 = Unlikely (U): severe risks to sustainability; Unable to Assess (U/A): Unable to assess the expected incidence and magnitude of risks to sustainability [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the MTR team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the MTR team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

    <https://popp.undp.org/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The Report length should not exceed *40* pages in total (not including annexes). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. If available [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Colour code this column only [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU [↑](#footnote-ref-18)